

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office
FLOOR DEBATE

February 22, 2005 LB 570

when my light...when I get to my light, then I will just elaborate on my view, and then we can talk again before we get to Select File. I think it's your time now anyway, though.

SENATOR CUDABACK: This is your time, Senator Landis.

SENATOR LANDIS: You're right, and I'll yield it to Senator Beutler, who I think has been exhausted his chance to talk.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Senator Beutler.

SENATOR BEUTLER: You're exhausting us both, Senator, doing good work. Now, I was also interested in Senator Chambers' point, and I'm not sure if I understood it correctly but let me...let me restate it in terms that I better understand. But you talk about if our law is in conflict with federal law, it's not...is it necessarily that federal law prevails? I mean, if it's not a matter of interstate commerce, I don't think federal law would prevail.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Senator Landis.

SENATOR LANDIS: You would have to be in a place where federal law does...should not have been passed, because it was beyond the authority of the federal government's enumerated powers, before you get to a place where a federal law would fail in conflict with a state law. The supremacy clause says federal law trumps. The only place where that wouldn't be the case is where you were essentially ultra vires, beyond the authority of the federal law, in which case you could have a case that perhaps would do that. I haven't found the federal government to be acting beyond their authority in constitutional law in 80 or 90 years. No Supreme Court has said, oh gosh, federal law doesn't cover that. We haven't just done it for almost a century.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Okay. Well, maybe it is the word "applicable" that's confusing. Thank you.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Thank you, Senator Beutler. Senator Landis, did you wish to use any more of your time? Senator Chambers,